

FILED

OCT 19 2005

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

NESTOR GUILLERMO PUCILL-
GOEDELMAANN; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 04-75391

Agency Nos. A79-533-553
A79-533-554

MEMORANDUM^{*}

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted October 11, 2005^{**}

Before: T.G. NELSON, TALLMAN and BEA, Circuit Judges.

Nestor Guillermo Pucill-Goedelmann and Sandra Marina Sozzi-Gonsalez,
natives and citizens of Argentina, petition pro se for review of the Board of

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) affirmance of an immigration judge’s denial of their joint application for asylum. We dismiss the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Petitioners failed to put the BIA on notice that they were raising a claim of persecution on account of an imputed political opinion or membership in a particular social group. They did not mention either ground in their asylum application or their Notice of Appeal or brief to the BIA, and instead conceded in their brief to the BIA that their claim of persecution did “not necessarily fall under the five protected grounds[.]” Petitioners thus failed to exhaust their administrative remedies, and we lack jurisdiction over the petition for review. *See Barron v. Ashcroft*, 358 F.3d 674, 678 (9th Cir. 2004) (per curiam).

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.